

**“MAKING RIFLEMEN FROM MUD”:
RESTORING THE ARMY’S CULTURE OF IRREGULAR WARFARE**

James D. Campbell

October 2007

Visit our website for other free publication downloads

<http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/>

[To rate this publication click here.](#)

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. As such, it is in the public domain, and under the provisions of Title 17, United States Code, Section 105, it may not be copyrighted.

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE OCT 2007		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2007 to 00-00-2007	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE 'Making Riflemen From Mud': Restoring the Army's Culture of Irregular Warfare				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 122 Forbes Avenue, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5244				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 35	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Ave, Carlisle, PA 17013-5244.

All Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications are available on the SSI Homepage for electronic dissemination. Hard copies of this report also may be ordered from our Homepage. SSI's Homepage address is: *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*.

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please subscribe on our homepage at *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/newsletter/newsletter.cfm*.

ISBN 1-58487-318-3

PREFACE

The U.S. Army War College provides an excellent environment for selected military officers and government civilians to reflect and use their career experience to explore a wide range of strategic issues. To assure that the research developed by Army War College students is available to Army and Department of Defense leaders, the Strategic Studies Institute publishes selected papers in its “Carlisle Papers in Security Strategy” Series.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Antulio J. Echevarria II', with a stylized, flowing script.

ANTULIO J. ECHEVARRIA II
Director of Research
Strategic Studies Institute

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

JAMES D. CAMPBELL is a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army. He is a 2007 graduate of the U.S. Army War College.

ABSTRACT

Prior to World War II, the Army had a deeply ingrained facility with and acceptance of what we now term unconventional warfare — raising, training, advising, and cooperating with tribal militias, local paramilitaries, and other nonstate armed groups. This culture of irregular warfare was attributable to nearly 300 years of American military tradition from the colonial period until 1941, including extensive experience in cooperating with Native American tribes and individual scouts during the expansion of the western frontier. These traditions of unconventional war reached maturity in the years of fighting on the western plains after the Civil War, and were given ultimate expression in the creation of the Philippine Scouts at the beginning of the 20th century. Since World War II, the wider military has lost this expertise in and comfortable familiarity with unconventional operations, with the Special Operations community taking on the sole proprietorship of this role. Given the variety of political environments in which today's conventional soldiers may find themselves and the current nature of conflicts ongoing and likely to occur in the world, the Army culture as a whole can and must readapt itself to the new old realities of irregular war.

“MAKING RIFLEMEN FROM MUD”: RESTORING THE ARMY’S CULTURE OF IRREGULAR WARFARE

INTRODUCTION¹

The leaders of regular units engaged in guerrilla operations must be extremely adaptable. They must study the methods of guerrilla war. They must understand that initiative, discipline, and the employment of stratagems are all of the utmost importance. As the guerrilla status of regular units is but temporary, their leaders must lend all possible support to the organization of guerrilla units from among the people.

—Mao Tse Tung, *On Guerrilla Warfare*²

In the summer of 1899, Lieutenant Matthew Batson was commanding L Troop, 4th U.S. Cavalry, during operations in the Philippines. Already recognized as an energetic and courageous officer during the war in Cuba, Batson gained further note after being awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for actions in combat with his troop in July.³ At the request of his superiors, in late summer Batson submitted a formal proposal for raising a scout company for the First Division’s Provisional Cavalry Brigade. The plan called for this company to be recruited from the Macabebes, an ethnic tribal group in Southern Luzon that had long opposed domination by the majority Tagalogs. The Tagalogs formed the backbone and provided most of the leadership for the Army of the Philippine Republic, fighting against U.S. rule in the archipelago. The Macabebes’ military usefulness had been previously recognized by the Spanish as they faced revolt and unrest prior to the war with the United States; large numbers of Macabebes had been recruited and served with the Spanish forces until their defeat and cession of the Philippines to the United States in 1898.⁴

The scout company proposed by Lieutenant Batson would consist of 100 soldiers, and would be trained and led by officers and noncommissioned officers (NCOs) from among the units of the Cavalry brigade and the First Division. On September 1, 1899, Batson received a memorandum from the division headquarters approving his plan, and he began immediately to raise his scouts, leading them in combat and working to gain approval to raise still more scout companies.⁵

From this small beginning, Batson’s Macabebe Scouts and other similar units raised elsewhere in the Philippines would eventually evolve into the Philippine Scouts, forming several infantry, cavalry, and artillery regiments composed of Philippine soldiers and fully incorporated into the U.S. Regular Army.⁶ The Philippine Scouts are unique in the American military experience, as they are the only large-scale “native” or colonial units to ever serve as a conventional part of the U.S. armed forces. What is not unique about the Scouts, however, is that the motives, rationale, and manner for which they were originally raised was an accepted, matter-of-fact technique employed by Army leaders for virtually the entire previous history of American armed conflict. This traditional practice of raising, training, and working closely with indigenous groups to assist in the prosecution of what we now term “low-intensity” military operations began in the

colonial period, reached a level of doctrinal maturity during the fighting on the Western plains and in the Southwest after the Civil War, and achieved its ultimate expression in the incorporation of the Philippine Scouts into the Regular Army in 1920.⁷

What happened to this traditional practice, which was at one time so implicitly accepted by the Army at large? The practice was once so ingrained in our military culture that the creation of the Philippine Scouts—and their largely civilian counterpart, the Philippine Constabulary—incited hardly more debate in Army circles than the adoption of the Lyster Bag for cool, purified water in 1910.⁸ Raising local troops and working closely with the local and tribal leadership to suppress insurgency and lawlessness in loosely governed or newly conquered areas were not carried out by special troops or elite units, but rather were the norm throughout the Army. Any officer could be expected to either raise local scouts or work with existing tribal organizations to accomplish his unit's goals. Yet since World War II, a connection to indigenous or tribal soldiers has increasingly become the sole province of the Special Forces (SF), and until quite recently the conventional Army had almost totally shunned the idea of such affiliation or cooperation; the exigencies of war in Afghanistan and Iraq have only just begun to break down the barriers. Aside from the relatively brief periods of large-scale high-intensity operations during the periods 1917-18, 1941-45, 1950-54, and the Gulf War of 1991, these developments have occurred in spite of the fact that the Army since 1900 has been operating and will continue to operate more and more in areas and situations where the ability to raise, train, and cooperate with local, tribal, and other nonstate armed groups is, if not a prerequisite, certainly a central factor for military and political success.

The literature on the new nature of warfare since the end of the Cold War is vast and growing. Authors have stressed that large-scale, “symmetrical” combat operations are a thing of the past, while “asymmetrical” warfare is the new paradigm militaries will face in the 21st century. This new paradigm of combat or stability operations applies to what author Thomas Barnett calls the “nonintegrating gap”⁹ areas of ungoverned or poorly governed space. These are places where poverty, crime, and the challenges posed by modernization of traditional societies result in endemic conflict. Here, new strategies and techniques are required for a western military like ours to be successful. As described by Richard Shultz and Andrea Dew in their recent book on terrorists, insurgencies, and nonstate militias,

war since 1990 has, with the exception of Desert Storm and the first phase of Operation Iraqi Freedom, been different from the modern Western understanding of armed combat. But the policymakers and military commanders of modern states—including the United States—have often failed to grasp this new battlefield. Indeed, for the policymakers the perception is the reverse—that conventional warfare prevails and thus the United States is more than adequately prepared to dominate the future face of war.¹⁰

This thoughtful statement, and others like it, should be familiar to any reader of recent literature dealing with security studies, military science, or international politics.

The ideas encapsulated there are clearly backed up by the realities in these troubled places, but in their stress on the “new” nature of conflict since the end of the Cold War, they tend to obscure much of what is not new. Viewed in the context of the almost 400 years of American military history and tradition, asymmetrical conflict, insurgency,

stability operations, and constabulary operations in ungoverned or poorly governed space are not new at all—in fact, they are the norm, while the high-intensity conflicts of the mid-20th century are the truly atypical episodes that diverge from the most common experiences of American warfare.

In the ongoing effort both to succeed in our current fights in Iraq, Afghanistan, the Philippines, East Africa, and elsewhere, and to continue the evolution of our doctrine and tactics to address upcoming threats, the Army must certainly look to the future. The Army must also, however, look to the past to recapture some of those organizational strengths that have led to success in our long history of low-level conflict. One of these strengths was the institutionalized practice of working with and through local irregular military forces. This practice and the comfort and ease with which the Army at large followed it in the period prior to the Cold War need to be reclaimed Army-wide. The culture of irregular warfare—advising, liaison, training, leading, and operating closely with local tribal levies, militias, and other nonstate forces—must be embraced enthusiastically by every part of the Army, as opposed to retaining current sole proprietorship in the Special Operations Command. Such a reform is imperative now more than ever, given the limited number of SF units and the demands currently being placed upon them. Conventional units must be able to conduct irregular operations wherever they are deployed.

This paper will examine both the Army's historical practice of working with indigenous forces and auxiliaries, and the institutional training programs formerly in place designed to prepare officers and soldiers for roles as advisors, working with irregular as well as regular forces. Using these examples while discussing current operations and the debates surrounding incorporation of local irregular troops into those operations, I shall propose measures that, if implemented by the Army, will restore the culture of capitalizing on indigenous forces in low-intensity conflicts.

This paper is not, let it be emphasized, a call for establishment of an American "foreign legion" or units of "native" or "colonial" troops. It is, rather, an argument for the restoration of one of our Army's historic strengths. It is a truism that the best means of fighting an insurgency is to persuade the local population to do it themselves. Additionally, the human intelligence potentially derived from close contact and cooperation with irregulars can be invaluable for the successful prosecution of counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, and other low-level operations. Proven in the wars during the establishment of Western empires and solidified in successful post-colonial counterinsurgencies, these dictums can continue to be ignored only at considerable risk of disaster. In seeking that which is new in the post-Cold War operating environment, we would do well to seek as well those parallels to our own heritage, and apply those strengths which have underlain much of our previous military success.

SCOUTS

The European and the Indian

Beginning with the earliest days of European colonial settlements in North America, white soldiers and militiamen worked in close cooperation with natives, learning, teaching, leading, and often employing Indians in the roles of guides, scouts, and interpreters. In

virtually every instance of warfare in the colonial period, whether in conflict with other whites or with the indigenous people themselves, colonists allied with, or employed as auxiliaries, members of native tribes. In the pattern of warfare as it evolved in colonial North America, the Europeans learned much from the Indians, adopting clothing, weapons, and tactics. The reverse was also true. In addition to such obvious transfers as firearms, some even argue that warfare to the point of annihilation – the practice of attempting to wipe out an enemy completely – was an innovation adopted by the Eastern tribes only after sustained contact with and emulation of colonists. The virtual annihilation in 1637 of the once powerful Pequot tribe was accomplished not solely by white colonists in New England, but also through close cooperation by virtually all the neighboring tribes as well.¹¹

Some of the best known examples of this early collaboration between whites and Indians in war came during the Seven Years War or, as it is termed in North America, the French and Indian War. During this war, previous cooperation between the Huron and the French encouraged and solidified the alliance between the Iroquois Confederacy and the British. Not a single major expedition or combat operation, British or French, occurred during this war without contingents of Indians fighting on either side. The tribes provided scouts and guides, interpreters, security for settlements and fortified garrisons, as well as larger forces for combat. Acting either alongside European allies, as part of secondary operations in concert with larger movements, or alone as surrogates, the Iroquois and Huron people were a significant part of this major conflict that determined dominance on the continent.¹²

There are two interesting sidelights to this close, almost symbiotic early cooperation between native Americans and Europeans in colonial warfare. The first is the evolution of what many feel is a uniquely American style of war, with an almost mythic emphasis on the individual rifleman and a reluctance to adopt the close-order tactics of 18th and 19th century European militaries.¹³ This “frontiersman” approach to fighting, along with the emergence of special “Ranger” units modeled on Indian formations, was in the eyes of many American military leaders, up to and including General Pershing during World War I, the special ingredient that made the United States Army not only different from its European counterparts, but better.¹⁴

The second salient aspect of military relationships with Indian tribes is the parallel between the English experience with the Iroquois in North America, and with the native people in their other imperial possessions, like Scotland and India. At the same time that some English officers were working with the Iroquois to fight the French and Huron, others were beginning the process of raising and incorporating the first large-scale numbers of “native” troops, the Scottish Highland regiments. The rhetoric employed by political leaders in Britain when discussing the Highland regiments and the martial qualities of the men who filled them, is very similar to the language used by the British leadership in describing their Indian allies, both North American and South Asian.¹⁵ Additionally, the political uses envisaged by men in the British government for their Highland troops were in some cases very similar to those employed in dealings with the native peoples of America.

Part of the justification for raising marching regiments from among the Highlanders in Scotland was to denude the Highlands of its large population of military age males,

culturally accustomed to and enamored of combat. Political leaders in London and Edinburgh sought to harness those martial energies by directing them towards Britain's external enemies. A corollary to this idea was that these men, once enlisted in the army, would serve as hostages, assuring the good behavior of their often rebellious relatives still in Scotland.¹⁶ Similarly, by encouraging Indian tribes to fight against one another, whites exploited divisions between native societies and prevented their unifying against the common threat of European domination. Indians would also thereby dissipate their military strength in internecine quarrels, and not in resisting British expansion. Indian leaders who agreed to cooperate with the British were in a sense offering themselves as hostages, for, by choosing sides, they sacrificed their ability to act independently and often even required protection later from the rebellions among their own people.¹⁷ Such themes as exploitation of native divisions, cynical though they are, have been enacted with some success by Americans throughout the period since. The U.S. Army did so on the frontier, as well as in the early 20th-century campaigns in the Philippines, Central America, and elsewhere, up to and including the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001.

The myths perpetuated by the British concerning the warlike qualities of native troops, and the resulting advantages to be gained in working with them to accomplish imperial goals, have also colored the discourse surrounding these issues in the United States, at least since the late 19th century. Certainly the recent advocacy by several writers for either enlisting in the U.S. military large numbers of foreign troops, or creating formal units of foreign scouts within the U.S. Army—to take advantage of the scouting and close-in fighting abilities of these native warriors—is connected, at least in part, to echoes of British imperial attitudes concerning the use of native troops.¹⁸

Expanding the Western Frontier

After the United States gained independence, colonial habits and techniques of warfare did not disappear, but were, if anything, more regularized. The national debate surrounding the establishment of a Regular Army, as opposed to reliance on a purely militia force, was directly connected to the perceived success of American militia in the wars both against the French and their native allies, as well as against the British.¹⁹ The customary practices of working with Indians in the process of expanding the western frontier did not change either.

In the campaigns against the tribes of the Old Northwest and in the Southern states, commanders like Anthony Wayne and later Andrew Jackson and Winfield Scott, employed local tribes and individual scouts in much the same way as had British and American leaders in the colonial period. During the War of 1812, again both the British and American sides had Indian allies. Both armies used Indian scouts, encouraging allied tribes to pursue their own ends by attacking rival frontier settlements and enemy troop concentrations. While fighting the Creeks in 1813-14, Andrew Jackson relied heavily on Cherokee allies, with large numbers of Cherokees playing a decisive role in the ultimate U.S. victory and slaughter of the Creeks at the battle of Horseshoe Bend.²⁰ While fighting the most intense of the Seminole Wars during the 1830s and 40s, the Army used native scouts to assist in tracking Seminole bands, and to provide commanders knowledge about the customs and habits of the Seminoles so that they would be better able to predict their

whereabouts and possible courses of action.²¹

In all of these instances, the facility with which American officers, both regular and militia, worked with the tribes is a trait we accept without comment. In fact, these practices at the time were so much a part of the normal, almost doctrinal way of carrying on operations as to be totally unremarkable. It would have been a rare officer indeed who was so blind as to try to prosecute a frontier campaign during this period without actively seeking cooperation or alliance with local Indian leaders, tribes, or even individual scouts. Virtually every account of military operations from the Revolution to the Civil War—including the Lewis and Clark Expedition, the Creek and Seminole Wars, and the Black Hawk War—includes references to native scouts and allies. As the frontier moved across the Mississippi westward, military leaders found it even more necessary than previously to make alliances with local Indian leaders, enlisting native people in the Army's attempts to subdue the plains tribes, and provide security and the rule of law in the loosely governed and often fractious settler communities.

United States Scouts

During the Civil War, both Federal and rebel forces enlisted Indians in their regular formations and, especially in the campaigns west of the Mississippi, used local Indians as scouts and in capacities similar to what the Army had always done in frontier areas. Additionally, when the Regular U.S. forces left garrisons in the West, local leaders had to increase their reliance on militia forces in order to manage these vast areas. Unrest and violence in the far West increased enormously during the Civil War, so much so that the U.S. Government actually had to divert troops from campaigns in the East to assist in quelling uprisings caused, in part, by inexperienced militia and by political and civic leaders instigating conflict. A notable example of this kind of violence was the massacre of a southern Cheyenne village at Sand Creek, Colorado; local volunteers took advantage of the absence of Regulars to destroy this local band of Indians, murdering men, women, and children. In fact, when the Army returned to the West after the war and signed several treaties to end the immediate conflicts, the units garrisoning the posts were in many cases far more sympathetic to the Indians than to the whites.²²

When the Army returned to its traditional role of policing the largely ungoverned areas of the Western frontier, it began to establish new posts and regarrison older ones in an ongoing effort to avert conflict between white settlers and the tribes. As a part of this increase in Army presence and activity on the frontier, many commanders sought to improve their capabilities in conducting what really amounted to what we would now term low-intensity fighting, or even counterinsurgency. One way they did this was to enlarge upon and formalize the previous tactics for employing native Indian scouts.

When the Army began to recognize the difficulty it would have in subduing the plains tribes and the Apache, they looked for Indian allies to assist them. In keeping with long-standing practice, many of these allies came from tribes which had been previously displaced or defeated by either the U.S. Government or other plains tribes, and who saw alliance with the Army as a mean of recovering a lost position or obtaining revenge. By using Indians to fight Indians, the Army again had a powerful tool to divide native opposition and demoralize the hostile tribes—with one general opining that one Indian Scout unit was more valuable than six cavalry companies.²³

In an attempt to formalize the customary but still haphazard practices of military cooperation with the Indians, the Army asked Congress for official approval of a scheme to enlist Indians into specifically designated scout units, and provide them pay, allowances, and formal discharges like any other soldiers. Consequently, on July 28, 1866, Congress authorized the formal enlistment of scouts into the Army as part of what became the U.S. Scouts:

The President is authorized to enlist and employ in the Territories and Indian country a force of Indians not to exceed one thousand to act as scouts, who shall receive the pay and allowances of cavalry soldiers, and be discharged whenever the necessity for further employment is abated, at the discretion of the department commander.²⁴

These scouts were finally absorbed into the Regular Army in 1895 as a formal unit that had its own distinctive insignia like the other branches of the Army, a device of crossed arrows, coupled with the letters "U.S.S." (United States Scouts), instead of the normal "U.S."²⁵ In accordance with the legislation, members of the Scouts enlisted for various periods based on local requirements, ranging from the normal cavalry enlistment of 5 years to periods as short as 3 to 6 months. Scouts could reenlist, and many were promoted to the rank of sergeant after long and faithful service. Scouts were enlisted and then assigned to serve in specific areas or Military Districts, and were allocated to units based on operational need.²⁶

As stated previously, since the colonial period, tribes would often form alliances with whites either to protect themselves or to gain an advantage against an enemy. The Scouts who enlisted after 1866 largely followed this same pattern and came from tribal groups who traditionally opposed the tribes at war with the government. Large numbers of Navajos enlisted to serve against the Apaches, and Crows served against the Sioux and Cheyenne. Working against his traditional enemies, the scout who warned Lieutenant Colonel George Custer of the large hostile encampment of Sioux and Cheyenne at the Little Bighorn in July 1876 was a Ree, sometimes identified as being from the Crow nation. In the ensuing battle this scout, Bloody Knife, was beheaded by the Sioux for his troubles.²⁷

One of the more notable examples of tribes who fit this pattern of working with the Army against traditional enemies was the Seminoles. The Seminole or Seminole-Negro Indian Scouts are one of the more prominent formal Indian Scout units raised by the Army during the late 19th century, and the background of this unit forms an interesting part of the often tragic story of mixed relations between the Army and Indians. After the forced removal in the 1830s and 1840s of the Seminoles from Florida to the Indian Territories (what is now Oklahoma), many Seminoles moved into Mexico to avoid attacks and conflict with the tribes already in the Oklahoma territory. A significant number of those who moved into Mexico were Black Seminoles, people descended either from slaves owned by the Seminoles, or escaped slaves who had been adopted as members of the tribe. A large part of their motivation for moving to Mexico was to escape being enslaved by whites immigrating into Texas and the Southwest. Some of the Black Seminoles served in the Mexican Army in campaigns against the Comanche and Apache.²⁸

In 1870 the Army began negotiations with the Black Seminoles to return to the United States and serve as scouts, principally in campaigns against the Comanche and

the Apache. Recognizing their skills and experience in fighting these tribes, the Army offered to relocate the entire community to Fort Clark, Texas, where they could live unmolested. Eventually, between 100 and 150 Black Seminoles enlisted in the Scouts, comprising a formal unit by 1872. In 1873 they participated in their first combat action. By the time they were finally disbanded in 1914, the Seminole-Negro Indian Scouts had achieved a distinguished record of success, with four members of the unit being awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.²⁹

During the campaigns against the Apache, the Army was able to enlist scouts from several tribes traditionally opposed to the Apache, and many Apaches enlisted as well. These Apache Scouts also achieved distinction, and became such an institution in the Army in the Southwest that they continued to serve as a distinct unit into the 1940s. Apache Scouts performed reconnaissance and security duties during the Mexican Punitive Expedition in 1916, and patrolled the southern border throughout the first half of the 20th century. The last Apache Scout retired from the Army in 1947.³⁰ Several officers who recruited and served with the Apache Scouts in the late 19th century under Generals George Crook and Nelson Miles went on to hold important senior leadership positions during the war with Spain, and it was one of these, Major General Henry Lawton, who as the commander of the 1st Division in the Philippines authorized Lieutenant Matthew Batson to raise the Macabebe Scouts in 1899.³¹

The record of the Army in prosecuting its frontier campaigns against the Indians is clearly checkered, with many examples of failure and cruelty, along with success and humanity. In this mixed record, one aspect of the Army's frontier operations from the 1780s to the late 19th century stands out: an almost unbroken record of dramatic success in working with local indigenous people to prosecute low-intensity or counterinsurgency campaigns. These campaigns, prosecuted over a century, were ultimately successful for the Army, resulting in a widely shared organizational expertise and comfort in conducting what we now term irregular warfare.

This expertise and facility in working with and through indigenous or tribal military forces were so ingrained that there was an institutional expectation that officers would, as a matter of course, immediately establish contacts, alliances, and contracts for auxiliaries with local and tribal leaders as soon as their units arrived in an area of operations. These kinds of arrangements were not pursued by a corps of elite or specially trained soldiers – they were made by regular, conventional officers who were merely following customary practice as established through military culture and experience beginning in the 1600s. Following the establishment of U.S. colonial dominion in the Philippines, this tradition and expertise carried over into the 20th century, achieving its ultimate expression in the formation of the Regular Philippine Scouts and the Philippine Constabulary.

“BULLETS AND BOLOS”: SCOUTS AND CONSTABULARY IN THE PHILIPPINES³²

Irregulars

When Lieutenant Batson began to recruit and lead his Macabebe Scouts, he was following a pattern familiar to most contemporary Army officers. Batson was not

the only officer involved with raising local units or cooperating with Filipino leaders and communities. As soon as combat operations began in the Philippines against the Republican Army led by Emilio Aguinaldo, American commanders all over the islands began to seek local people who would assist in the U.S. effort. In many ways, enlisting Filipinos to fight Filipinos carried on the tradition of using Indians to fight other Indians. As stated in a contemporary textbook used at West Point, one of the best methods to oppose guerrillas was to use "forces of a similar character," and this adage was generally accepted as valid.³³ Filipino assistance to the Army came in many forms aside from providing combat or scout units: thousands of Filipinos worked for U.S. forces as guides, interpreters, laborers, drivers, clerks, and intelligence agents. Some of these Filipino irregulars were paid with Quartermaster funds, some from special accounts created by the Philippine command, and others from U.S. officers' personal funds.³⁴

While Batson raised his scout companies, other officers were doing the same in other parts of the archipelago. In July 1899, the Philippine command established the Manila Native Police, which eventually reached a strength of 625, and made 7,442 arrests in its first year of existence.³⁵ On the Island of Negros, military governor Colonel James F. Smith of the 1st California Volunteers raised an entire constabulary, armed with rifles, for patrolling and protecting the island against guerrillas and criminals.³⁶ At the same time that Batson was raising his scouts, another unit, Lowe's Scouts, was operating with the First Division as a mixed Filipino and American organization. Lowe's Scouts were often paired with Batson's unit, enjoying great success in numerous combat operations.³⁷

After the success of Batson's initial efforts with the Macabebes, he was given permission to expand his unit. In a memo dated October 16, 1899, Batson's Brigade Commander Brigadier General S. B. M. Young justified his approval of this expansion: "I have no doubt that a regiment of Macabebes would be more effective than a regiment of volunteers, and would be only about one half as expensive. . . . I have full faith in the loyalty and efficiency of the Macabebes as soldiers. There is as a rule no sickness among them, and they can live on the country."³⁸

Batson was promoted to Major in December 1899 and continued to recruit. By the spring of 1900, Batson's unit had grown to a full squadron of five companies. On May 24, 1900, the Philippine Command published a formal order establishing the unit as the "Squadron of Philippine Cavalry," formed under the auspices of Colonel Wilbur Wilder, 43rd U.S. Volunteer Infantry, with Major Batson as Squadron Commander.³⁹ After an operation on Luzon in April 1900, Brigadier General Frederick G. Grant wrote of the Philippine Cavalry, "In the Macabebe Scouts, the United States has a loyal servant who can be depended on to pick out of a crowd of natives, however large, all the insurgents masquerading as 'amigos' and the culprits from other provinces."⁴⁰ Readers can imagine how extraordinarily valuable such units would be to U.S. forces operating in Iraq and Afghanistan today.

The praise given the Macabebe Scouts by Generals Young and Grant was familiar to that given scouts and units formed from the Indians of the American West, but so were the doubts that many officers in the Philippines harbored about the performance of local scouts. From the beginnings of American military cooperation with Indians, officers had been concerned about the use by Indians of tactics that did not sit well with European sensibilities. Traditional Native American customs of warfare which involved the torture

or mistreatment of captives, mutilation, scalping of the dead, and later adaptations like killing of women and children, all militated against their use as auxiliaries. These arguments continued throughout the entire period of frontier warfare in the United States, with many officers' prejudices against native people leading them to scorn the use of Indian scouts in spite of their proven record of operational success. On the other hand, most successful officers, such as Generals George Crook and Nelson Miles, knew the value of Indian scouts and used them extensively in all of their campaigns.⁴¹

The debate surrounding enlistment of Philippine locals followed much the same pattern. While always officially defending his men,⁴² Batson himself wrote to his wife about his concerns that the Macabebes could be brutal in their treatment of local Tagalogs in the barrios and countryside they occupied.⁴³ Lieutenant Colonel E. H. Plummer actually asked that the Macabebes be removed from his area of operations after a series of rapes and robberies.⁴⁴ In many areas, Army units were stretched very thin and were forced to rely on local Filipino units to assist them on operations, often in spite of serious concerns about their behavior:

... the police of San Miguel de Mayumo, for example, were adept at hunting down guerrillas, but their methods were so brutal that the post commander was warned, "If native police or any other natives are used as scouts, guides, or in any way as part of your force or command, you will be held responsible for their conduct and behavior under G.O. [General Order] 100 of 1863, and the laws of war generally."⁴⁵

Although the War Department in Washington urged General Otis, Commander of U.S. Forces in the Philippines, to raise more local units, he disapproved many requests like Batson's due to concerns about brutality and the loyalty of local auxiliaries.⁴⁶ Still, many officers carefully sidestepped regulations about arming locals, and continued to raise police and constabulary units, as well as scouts.

Regulars

When Batson's Scouts were formally constituted as the Philippine Cavalry Squadron, it was as part of a larger process begun by General Arthur MacArthur when he took command from General Otis in May 1900. One of MacArthur's first acts as commander was to issue G.O. 87, directing "the arming of municipal police and the creation of mounted 'constabulary bodies,' which henceforth would be the 'conservators of the peace and safety of districts, instead of [confining] their operations to areas limited by the boundaries of towns and barrios'."⁴⁷ This order began the process which ultimately led to the creation of large bodies of Philippine troops officered by Americans, as well as the creation of the Philippine Constabulary, which, as a paramilitary police force, would be instrumental in quelling rebellion throughout the islands well into the 20th century.⁴⁸

After MacArthur's order, commanders around the islands began in earnest to raise local scout and constabulary units to assist in suppressing the rebellion as well as the lawlessness plaguing many places in the Philippines that had never been effectively governed or policed by the Spanish. In Northern Luzon in January 1901, Colonel Charles Hood, after having raised several detachments of scouts, persuaded the Headquarters in Manila to recognize them officially (Government Order [GO] 4) as the Cagayan Native

Scouts. The four companies of this battalion were commanded by lieutenants from the 16th U.S. Infantry, with each company having two NCOs detailed from the 16th Infantry as well.⁴⁹ Additionally, under the direction of Luzon's 4th District Commander Brigadier General Frederick Funston, Colonel Lyman W. Kennan raised 100 Ilocano Scouts, and later increased the size of the unit to 240 in January 1901.⁵⁰

By early 1901, so many local commanders were raising Filipino units to fight the insurgency that the government authorities in Manila sought a means of regularizing the practice, emplacing policies and rules for how these units were to be recruited, organized, equipped, and administered. In February 1901, some inkling of what was to come was revealed in a letter to Major Batson. This letter from the Office of the Chief Commissary, Philippine Islands, sought the benefit of Batson's experience with local soldiers by soliciting his recommendations on types of rations projected for issue to "large numbers of native troops contemplated in the near future."⁵¹ Then, reflecting a recent authorization by Congress, GO 310 issued in October 1901 arranged for the enlistment of up to 6,000 Filipinos into roughly 50 companies of what was to be termed the Philippine Scouts. These companies of 100 men would all have American officers, selected in many cases from NCO volunteers from Regular Army regiments in the Philippines.⁵²

Beginning in 1904, these companies were organized into battalions that were then incorporated into the Regular Army during the period of military reorganization (1919-24) following World War I. By 1924, officers in the Philippine Scouts had the same status as that of their counterparts in other Regular units, save that their rank was followed by the initials "PS" (Philippine Scouts), and they could not command American troops while assigned to the Scouts. Soldiers in the Scouts were treated the same as other Regulars, except that they were paid less than American soldiers – excused by the War Department on the grounds that Filipino soldiers did not need the same amount of money that American soldiers did, and that furthermore if they were paid too highly, it would cause disruption in the local society and economy.⁵³

The process by which these local and tribal levies, militias, and scout units became U.S. Regulars is fascinating for many reasons, suggesting much about contemporary American ideas concerning race, military necessity, and larger concerns about imperialism, to name just a few.⁵⁴ It is also worth noting that the American experience in creating the Scouts is just a small part of the larger process of late 19th-century Western militaries raising native troops worldwide in areas where they were establishing colonial dominion. Askaris in German East Africa; Moroccan Goumiers and Senegalese Tirailleurs in French Africa; and Britain's King's African Rifles and the Queen's Own Corps of Guides all fit into the same category as the Philippine Scouts – soldiers locally raised from tribal or other groups in order to assist in policing new colonial possessions.⁵⁵ Virtually all of these types of units later formed the basis of new national armies and police during the post-World War II period of decolonization.

For the purposes of this paper, however, it is instructive to note that the story of the creation of the Philippine Scouts tells us much about the deeply ingrained culture of irregular warfare in the U.S. Army at the time. Officers, in spite of some official discouragement, openly clamored for the authority to raise such units, which they saw as an absolute practical necessity for conducting a successful counterinsurgency campaign. These officers raised units with, and often without, formal authorization, and also co-

opted and armed local police, tribal groups, and even some religious groups all in the name of prudent military improvisation.⁵⁶ Officers were also willing to make what many saw as moral compromises in view of cultural differences. Recognizing that Filipino tribesmen might not share the same ideas about the Law of War that were held by their American leadership, officers sought to make cultural changes incrementally rather than shun the use of local troops altogether.⁵⁷

Army leaders ranging from Generals Crook to Pershing, from the commander of the Constabulary, Brigadier General Henry Allen, to General Leonard Wood, all recognized that “the successful leader of native troops had to exhibit all the traits of a paternal strongman, sufficiently aloof from his charges to gain their allegiance while demonstrating a genuine concern for their welfare and a respect for their cultural idiosyncrasies.”⁵⁸ Once again, this recognition and acceptance that cultural change could and should be made in the context of ongoing engagement and cooperation with local forces stems directly from the Army’s long experience with indigenous forces on the American frontier.

The practical experience gained in centuries of irregular warfare on the American frontier was confirmed in the jungles of the Philippines. The incorporation of myriad scout units into the regular forces was almost an official afterthought, an attempt to put controls in place to standardize procedures and administrative arrangements, to confirm a situation by regulation that in practice already existed. The act of making the Philippine Scouts part of the Regular Army thus mirrored the progression of formalizing the Indian Scouts, culminating in the creation of the United States Scouts in 1895.

Specialization

From the turn of the century extending into the 1920s when the Scouts became regulars, numerous American officers who had served with them and the Constabulary went on to distinguished careers elsewhere in the military – Generals John Pershing and Leonard Wood are particularly salient examples.⁵⁹ Twenty-five former Philippine Constabulary officers went on to become generals in the Regular Army.⁶⁰ A fascinating example of this kind of American officer from the turn of the 20th century is Colonel John R. White. White is perhaps not entirely typical in his career progression, but his career represents what many at the time would have considered an enviable mix of experiences. In that he is not unlike many of his contemporaries such as General Frederick Funston, who sought out combat duty wherever it was and whoever it was with, White certainly provides a stellar model for the conventional American soldier with a broad range of “regular” and “irregular” service.

Colonel White began his military career as a volunteer in the Greek Foreign Legion as a teenager, fighting the Ottomans in the Balkan Wars. After leaving Greece, White prospected for gold in the Klondike, and then in 1898 enlisted in the Army for infantry service in the Philippines. In 1901, at the age of 21, like many other serving and former NCOs, he was offered a commission in the newly formed Philippine Constabulary. During his time in the Constabulary, he was extremely active, participating in counterinsurgency operations all over the islands, and raising the first Moro Constabulary company in Sulu province. He eventually retired from the Constabulary, only to be recalled to active service for World War I in 1918.⁶¹

White's career exemplifies the ease with which contemporary officers moved from conventional to irregular assignments and back. The unremarkable nature of this kind of transition was repeated in the assignment histories of numerous officers of the time. It was, paradoxically, the "regularization" of the Scouts and Constabulary, and the success of some officers in leading them, that began the process of creating a distinction in the Army between those men who worked with "native" troops, and those who did not. It was only when service with such organizations began to be seen somehow as a separate track, different from the normal progression of a conventional career, that it came to be viewed as a "specialization" and thus not career-enhancing. When in 1924 the Marines were charged with building the Nicaraguan National Guard into a modern, effective military, they worked with the State Department to contract with a retired Army officer to lead the effort. Major Calvin B. Carter was hired because of his experience in training and leading units of the Philippine Constabulary, with the Marines and State Department feeling that this experience gave him some unique skills not possessed by the average officer. Carter put his skills gained in the Philippines to work, but met with mixed results.⁶²

Major Carter's employment in Nicaragua is just one example of the process by which officers began to be perceived as specialized in irregular warfare, or in training "native" troops in the years between the World Wars. In fact, by the start of World War II, the Army's widely shared experience and comfort in working with indigenous, local forces, had begun to disappear – slowly becoming the province of officers who had been assigned to the Scouts, had experience with irregulars, or served with other foreign forces. In the interwar years, irregular warfare came to be seen in official Army circles as inconsequential given the existing threat posed by potential large-scale, conventional armies like those of Germany and the Soviet Union. As a result of this perception, "small wars" doctrine was given short shrift in military education at this time, with a focus on irregular war or constabulary duties coming to be seen in professional circles as extrinsic to an officer's development.⁶³ Prior to and during World War II, with the dramatic expansion of the Army and the consequent "watering down" of the officer corps with men who had no experience whatever in irregular warfare or local troops, this essentially accidental tendency toward specialization became even more pronounced.⁶⁴

With specialization came a marked reluctance on the part of many ambitious career officers to put themselves in positions where they might need to work with irregulars. Clearly part of this reluctance stemmed from the recognition of potential moral problems inherent in irregular operations.⁶⁵ A stark example of this reluctance is provided by Edwin Ramsey in his memoir of fighting with the anti-Japanese guerrillas in the Philippines. Ramsey relates how, after the capitulation of U.S. forces on Bataan, he and some other Philippine Scout officers escaped capture by the Japanese and linked up with a nascent guerrilla organization. Ramsey relates how numerous regular American officers who had escaped from the Japanese refused to take part in the guerrilla war. They felt that such fighting was at least in part illegal, and they wanted no part of living as fugitives and working with Filipino irregulars. Ramsey explains that he made his own decision to live and fight with the partisans in part because of the bonds of respect and loyalty he developed with Filipinos while serving in the pre-war Scouts.⁶⁶

Though some small numbers of former Scout officers or men with irregular experience did achieve high rank in the post-World War II conventional Army,⁶⁷ by the early 1950s the separation between the conventional Army and the Special Operations community was virtually complete. Men who had worked in the Office of Strategic Services with units like Detachment 101 in Burma, raising and leading Kachin tribesmen against the Japanese,⁶⁸ and others who either as intelligence officers or combatants were infiltrated into occupied areas to work with partisans, were increasingly seen as a corps of special soldiers with uncommon knowledge. This view would have been rare indeed in the Army only a few years previously. The career of one of these men who worked in unconventional operations during World War II, Colonel Jay Vanderpool, in some ways belied the nascent paradigm of specialization, but in other ways exemplifies the contemporary attitudes about irregular war that led to specialization.

During the war in the Pacific theater, Vanderpool was a young artillery officer serving in the 25th Infantry Division G2 section. As the plans for reconquest of the Philippines began to take shape, General MacArthur's headquarters solicited subordinate units for officer volunteers willing to be infiltrated into the archipelago to establish contact with partisans, and coordinate their efforts in support of the invasion.⁶⁹ A request of this nature, seeking motivated volunteers from among all units instead of specifically assigning specialized soldiers to this mission, is indicative of the prewar attitudes clearly still held by senior officers in the Pacific, who continued to subscribe to the position that irregular work remained part and parcel of a career officer's duty portfolio.

Vanderpool, one of those who volunteered, spent months in southern Luzon working with various guerrilla groups, including native tribes, Filipinos, Chinese Communists, and the native communist movement, the Hukbalahaps or Huks. Vanderpool spent much of his time trying to prevent these disparate elements from fighting each other over territory, local power, and resources, and was successful only through the judicious distribution of dollars and the threat of force once the invasion came. Ultimately, he managed to keep them in the fight against the Japanese. After the war, Vanderpool returned to a career in conventional Military Intelligence assignments, which continued until the Korean War.⁷⁰

During that war, as a result of Vanderpool's previous experience in the Philippines, he was specifically selected to run partisan operations in Korea, managing logistics and operational issues for North Korean and Chinese deserters as they conducted raids and sabotage behind enemy lines.⁷¹ In spite of his extensive experience in unconventional operations, Vanderpool did not move into the area of Special Operations after Korea but returned to the conventional Army, taking up such work as doctrine and force development for the new branch, Army Aviation, and retiring as the Deputy G4, Third Army at Fort MacPherson, Georgia.⁷²

Even though Vanderpool was able to return to a conventional career, his assignment during the Korean War points out the differences between the pre-World War II Army's culture of nonspecialization, and the beginnings of an institutional desire to have only those officers with special experience or other qualifications work with locals or irregulars. It is highly probable that had the Army's culture of comfort with irregular warfare never been lost, any young officer, regardless of experience, with the right qualities of leadership and courage would have been chosen to perform Vanderpool's job in Korea. Vanderpool

would not have been perceived as having any kind of unique or “special” qualification.

By the time war broke out in Korea in 1950, this transformation from a culture of generalized experience, comfort, and facility in irregular warfare to one of specialization was largely complete. The only remaining area where officers who were now officially termed “conventional” could work with non-U.S. forces was as advisors, part of the burgeoning Cold War system of military assistance to allied and developing countries to keep them out of the Soviet orbit. A review of the programs set up to train officers as advisors during the 1950s and early 1960s will be useful, showing how what remained in the wider Army’s culture of experience with irregular or non-U.S. troops was transmitted to a new generation in time for the major counterinsurgency efforts in Vietnam. This review can also help to point out some possibilities for a restoration of the Army’s widespread capabilities in irregular war.

TRAINING FOR ADVISORS

The Military Assistance Institute

During the height of the Cold War, the United States maintained Military Assistance Advisory Groups (MAAG) in a host of countries around the world, some with close traditional allies such as Britain and France, and many in newer, developing countries. These MAAGs, consisting of officers from all the services, performed a host of functions, many of which have now been assumed by military attaches and foreign area officers. Some of these functions were liaison, intelligence gathering, supervision of equipment sold or given to countries, and, of course, training and advising a host country’s military.⁷³ To accomplish these missions in an era of heightened tension and high-stakes geopolitical competition, the United States relied heavily on this relatively small group of “soldier-diplomats,” men whose training and experience were critical to ensuring that American interests were served in sensitive locations.

For most of the 1950s, there was no special training given to members of advisory groups, perhaps on the assumption that many senior officers had extensive combat experience in World War II and did not need much more than a briefing on the location where they were to be assigned. For example, officers serving as advisors in South Korea during the war there were given only a short manual outlining their duties. This manual included a section admonishing them on the importance of their positions and the necessity to maintain professionalism, while observing carefully all that their Korean counterparts did or failed to do. This manual contained almost nothing about cultural issues unique to Korea, nor did it cover anything political. It also had nothing in it to assist a newly assigned officer with the Korean language.⁷⁴

Clearly this lack of special training for advisors cried out for rectification. Positions as critical as these to our national security and strategic objectives required officers with detailed knowledge of the countries to which they were assigned. They also required men who could navigate these sometimes complex cultures while ensuring that the military objectives of international relations were met in the most effective way possible. By the end of the decade, MAAG chiefs petitioned the Department of Defense (DoD) to create a program of training for newly assigned advisors, and with that petition the State

Department emphasized that skills in international relations were as important for these officers as specifically military competence. Accordingly, in 1957 DoD turned to retired Brigadier General Henry Newton to establish a DoD school that would train officers in the skills required for success as members of MAAGs.⁷⁵

Newton had had a career in the Army training hierarchy, and one of his final assignments on active duty was as the director of the program to train U.S. personnel for constabulary duty in occupied Germany.⁷⁶ The school he created and presided over from 1958 to 1964 was called the Military Assistance Institute, located in Arlington, Virginia. According to the official historical report on the school, published in 1969 after it was closed, the Institute's curriculum included, but was not limited to, subjects such as U.S. foreign policy programs and practices, the relationship of the U.S. Government to the countries where MAAGs were assigned, how the MAAG system operated, the responsibilities of the different agencies involved in the system, and orientation on specific countries.⁷⁷

Officers who attended the Institute were assigned to a wide range of locations, from Afghanistan and Iran to Guinea, Norway, Bolivia, and Uruguay, including, of course, places like Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos—71 countries in all.⁷⁸ The Institute provided a detailed course for these officers which lasted for varying times based on the country to which men were to be assigned. Some of the specific topics of courses taught were the Role of the MAAG Officer in Counterinsurgency, Meeting the Appeal of Communism, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)/MAAG Field Cooperation, The Interpreter and the MAAG Officer, Techniques of Advising, and Advisor Case Studies. Additionally, each student participated in a detailed country study, which again varied in length and scope based on the location of assignment.⁷⁹

This Institute operated from 1958 until 1968, when its functions were subsumed in the several courses operated at the then U.S. Institute of Military Assistance, later changed and renamed the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School (JFKSWCS).⁸⁰ In later years, many of the functions of the MAAGs were taken over by Foreign Area Officers and much of what was formerly taught at the Institute was adapted for their purposes. Newton continued to work for the DoD education establishment until the 1970s, conducting detailed reviews of officer branch schools and the Army's precommissioning training programs as part of the Haines Board on Army officer education.⁸¹

While the officers who were assigned to MAAGs and attended the Military Assistance Institute were not supposed to be advisors to tactical units in foreign countries, many acted as such, especially later in the 1960s as the war in Vietnam escalated. The importance of the Institute for the purposes of this paper, is that it provides an example of the extensive training and education that were deemed necessary for conventional officers to have before being assigned to work with foreign militaries. Clearly, with the complexities of the international system after World War II, such extensive training was needed. There is also no question that, given the evolution (or devolution) of the international system since 1991 and the increase in expeditionary involvement of the Army, a similar education is now desirable for the widest possible circle of officers, well beyond the ones now designated as Foreign Area Officers. Other examples exist of the emphasis the Army has previously placed on educating conventional officers slated to work either with foreign militaries or with irregulars. Two of these are the successor organization to the Military Assistance Institute, to be discussed in the next section, and the training in counterinsurgency at the Infantry School and other institutions during the Vietnam War.

The U.S. Institute of Military Assistance and Counterinsurgency Training

The U.S. Institute of Military Assistance was the name given to the group of schools operated by the Army at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, where the Army's Psychological Operations (PSYOPS), Civil Affairs (CA), and SF soldiers were trained. As stated previously, this organization took over many of the responsibilities of the Military Assistance Institute when it was closed in 1968, and it was also responsible for training NCOs and officers destined to be tactical advisors to units of the Army of the Republic of South Vietnam (ARVN).⁸² This role eventually became one of the more time- and resource-intensive of its missions. A review of the curriculum of the courses for advisors destined for South Vietnam is again useful in pointing out how the Army viewed the advisor mission and the emphasis placed on preparing conventional officers for that mission. Extensive efforts were made in the 1960s to inculcate in soldiers some of the unfamiliar tenets of unconventional warfare that were commonplace among soldiers of the pre-World War II Army. These efforts led, in part, to a much broader Army-wide understanding of irregular operations which, unfortunately, has generally not survived beyond the generation of soldiers who fought in Vietnam.

In July 1971 Brigadier General Newton conducted a review and assessment of the Institute of Military Assistance as part of a wider review of Army branch schools and officer education directed by the Commanding General, U.S. Continental Army Command.⁸³ This process was put in motion, in part, to assess the changes the Army would need to make when the draft ended and the transition to an all-volunteer force began. In the report of his visit to Fort Bragg, Newton provided details on the courses taught at the Institute, both those strictly for Special Operations soldiers and those for advisors. The courses for advisors were conducted under the aegis of the Military Advisors School, which was, like the Special Warfare School, a separate school making up part of the Institute. The Military Advisors School was responsible not only for training MAAG officers, but also for conventional training of tactical unit advisors. At the Advisors School, there were six different courses. Training options ranged from the 22-week Military Assistance Command and Staff Course (preparation for officers assigned to MAAG positions in international security and military assistance) to the 6-week Military Assistance Training Advisor Officer and NCO Courses (designed to train officers and NCOs for duty as advisors in ARVN units).⁸⁴

Two of the courses offered at the Advisors School were specifically designed for soldiers who would work within the Civil Operations and Rural Development Support (CORDS) program in Vietnam, where they were closely involved with the South Vietnamese Regional and Popular Forces (RF/PF), those irregular paramilitary organizations providing local security for villages and regions within South Vietnam.⁸⁵ By 1969, U.S. Commander in Vietnam General Creighton Abrams had begun to put vastly more resources and emphasis into programs like CORDS and into the RF/PF so as to refocus the military campaign on local counterinsurgency.⁸⁶ It is not hard to imagine, then, that the men who were being sent to Vietnam to serve as advisors for these local forces would understand the importance of their mission. In the 6-week course, these men received training in the Vietnamese language and culture, as well as instruction in counterinsurgency doctrine, Vietnam-specific tactics, and civic action. These advisor

courses were perhaps the most intensive of the counterinsurgency-related training the Army provided, but were certainly not the only training designed to prepare officers and soldiers for the atmosphere they would encounter in Vietnam.⁸⁷

Starting in the early 1960s, the Army began to devote an enormous amount of intellectual effort to understanding insurgencies and the means to combat them. In addition to establishing libraries and encouraging articles and discussion, the Army leadership in 1961 ordered that counterinsurgency be covered in all levels of officer professional education. The Special Warfare School had the lead in providing draft subject courses that branch schools could use in developing their instruction. After some spotty initial efforts by the military to develop and implement satisfactory programs, the President directed in National Security Action Memorandum 131 (1962) that all agencies involved in counterinsurgency, including the Department of State, DoD, the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), USAID, and the CIA, establish counterinsurgency education programs.⁸⁸ These programs were to include specific subject areas at all levels of rank and education, including the history and nature of insurgency, insurgent tactics, and counterinsurgency techniques and planning. Mid- and senior-grade officers were to receive specific instruction on the country to which they were slated for posting. By the end of the decade, the average officer branch course included up to 28 hours of “pure” counterinsurgency instruction, as well as many additional hours in related subjects.⁸⁹

ROTC and West Point cadets also received instruction in counterinsurgency and compress unconventional warfare, including history courses focused on past wars in the Philippines, Greece, Malaya, and French Indochina. The officer precommissioning programs also included patrolling and raiding exercises in summer camps.⁹⁰ The Infantry School especially went to great lengths to develop training that prepared officers for the unconventional warfare environment, teaching tactics proven successful not only in Vietnam but in the Philippines and during the campaigns on the Western frontier as well. According to the school, its career course for captains emphasized that in the tactical realm, “The majority of the day-to-day activity . . . will be small-unit action to locate guerrilla forces, secure the population, installations and lines of communication, *train and assist the indigenous paramilitary forces*, and conduct military civic action (emphasis by author)⁹¹

Not only did the branch schools, again especially the Infantry School, and precommissioning courses emphasize the military and political aspects of counterinsurgency and unconventional warfare, but the Command and General Staff College and Senior Service Colleges did so as well, requiring officers to prepare plans for military-political operations, as well as take courses and write papers on historical and modern counterinsurgency operations.⁹² All of these levels of counterinsurgency and unconventional warfare leader training in the Army were paralleled by specific training efforts for soldiers and NCOs, including wide dissemination of such topics as quick-fire weapons training, patrolling, and interaction with irregulars.⁹³

The scope of the training designed to prepare the Army for operations in Vietnam was broad but intensive, while the concepts promulgated by that training were quite comprehensive. These training efforts, coupled with accumulating combat experience in Vietnam, resulted in a generation of soldiers who had a level of understanding and comfort with counterinsurgency and unconventional warfare that had not existed in

the Army since before 1941, and perhaps even before 1918. These men had worked closely with ARVN counterparts, local paramilitary irregulars in the RF/PF and Civilian Irregular Defense Groups (CIDG), as well as with Vietnamese soldiers attached directly to their squads and platoons—the Kit Carson Scouts. Unfortunately, one of the many results of the war in Vietnam has been a lasting reluctance, even resistance, to the idea of our Army again becoming involved in counterinsurgency or low-level warfare, with an almost exclusive doctrinal emphasis until the last 2 or 3 years on large-scale conventional warfighting. This institutional distaste for low-level conflict has persisted in spite of the fact that since 1975 we have been engaged in numerous low-level contingency operations (actually, more or less continuous since 1989).

The resistance in some quarters of the Army to conventional, or even SF, units conducting unconventional operations—liaison, cooperation, training, equipping, target reconnaissance, and advising militias, guerrillas, or other nonstate armed groups in combat—is still widespread and significant.⁹⁴ The separation of the SF troops from the mainstream Army personnel system in 1989 was a contributor to this continued resistance; when SF officers moved back and forth from conventional assignments to SF assignments, their knowledge, experience, and, more importantly, their mindset regarding unconventional warfare had a chance of being disseminated within the wider Army. There is no question about the necessity and success of the decision to make SF a distinct branch, but with that decision the Army did lose a valuable process for intellectual and cultural cross-fertilization.

This cross-fertilization was dramatically apparent during the war in Vietnam, through the extensive training efforts undertaken and practical experience gained in the face of such a massive, lengthy counterinsurgency challenge. The results of all these efforts and experiences point out to us today that a restoration of the wider Army's culture of understanding and acceptance of unconventional warfare is clearly possible. The equally clear fact that such a restoration is necessary is borne out by our Army's experiences in Afghanistan, Iraq, the Philippines, the Horn of Africa, and elsewhere since 1991.

CONCLUSION

During the winter and spring of 2006, the Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force in Afghanistan (CJSOTF-A) underwent a laborious process to demobilize its Afghan surrogate force, called the Afghan Security Forces (ASF). This process involved the largest formal demobilization of U.S. surrogate or irregular forces since 1945.⁹⁵ The ASF were composed of a variety of tribal or local militias, anti-Taliban volunteers, and Afghan mercenaries. Many of them had been working with the Special Forces since 2001, as they were originally members of the Northern Alliance, the coalition of Afghans which overthrew the Taliban with U.S. help. The ASF provided local security to Special Forces firebases and camps throughout Afghanistan, and prior to 2006 were also used extensively to assist SF units in convoy security and small-scale combat operations.⁹⁶

The ASF also provided a vitally important adjunct to U.S. counterinsurgency operations, one which experienced American soldiers have valued and seen as central to success in many campaigns. From the Pequot War in 1637 to the Seminole Wars in the early 19th century to the Apache campaigns after the Civil War to 20th-century small wars from

the Philippines to Vietnam, this adjunct is one of the main reasons American soldiers have always sought out cooperation with local irregular forces. This critical factor is human intelligence, which supplies a knowledge of local geography, culture, language, and personality that no outsider can ever hope to gain without such cooperation with immediately neighboring forces. Such human intelligence was the very asset provided by the Seminole, Apache, Macabebe Scouts, and others. The ASF were an invaluable source of local intelligence, one that even the Afghan National Army or police could not provide, since they were nationally recruited forces without the local or sometimes even provincial connections possessed by the ASF.⁹⁷

Given their importance, military value, and proven record of success, why were the ASF demobilized? There is a complex set of answers to this question, many dealing directly with concerns held by the Afghan government and coalition command about nongovernment militias, sovereignty, and legitimacy. Those officers who were involved in planning and carrying out the demobilization understood that there was also another important reason, one which was perhaps not so clearly articulated. It was an enduring discomfort with the existence and military use of irregular forces by the coalition.⁹⁸ Questions of loyalty, brutality, cost, and effectiveness all played a role in this distaste, much as they have throughout our history of cooperation with and employment of irregulars. Many of the concerns felt within the Army and elsewhere about cooperation with these irregulars had not changed since the operations at Tora Bora and Shalikit in 2002.⁹⁹ In spite of these questions, the fact remains that these irregular soldiers contributed enormously to the ongoing campaign in Afghanistan. Setting aside the fact that in many instances they were the ones who had fought against and overthrown the Taliban, their subsequent contributions have often been the crucial factors in determining the success of an operation.

For many of the reasons previously discussed, this enduring distaste for military cooperation with and employment of irregulars is not likely to go away. Neither, however, are the crucial reasons for our Army to continue to work with and through just such irregulars. Now more than ever, given that we will continue to operate in areas of poorly or completely ungoverned space—places where those holding sway are tribal or sectarian militias, or forces employed by local “warlords” or strongmen, or even the regular or paramilitary forces of host nations—we need to restore and embrace as part of a wider Army culture this facility and willingness to engage in unconventional and irregular operations.

So how can we restore this formerly prevalent advantage enjoyed by our Army, indeed by our military at large? There are several ways in which this can be done. The first is through experience—in the last several years an increasing number of conventional officers and soldiers have gained first-hand experience working with irregulars and advising foreign regulars and paramilitaries in our campaigns around the world. The exigencies of the ongoing war have provided a powerful incentive for the wider organization to adopt unconventional policies and procedures which until recently were seen as being the exclusive preserve of the SF. A clear example of this type of spontaneous local cooperation with tribal forces is in the 3rd Battalion, 4th Marine Regiment’s work with the tribes in Fallujah in 2004-05. By encouraging and enabling tribal elders to take responsibility for the security of their own local areas, the Marines were able to make

great inroads against the insurgency in that city.¹⁰⁰ As an organization, we must continue to encourage local commanders to take these kinds of initiatives, and disseminate the lessons they learn throughout all of our units. This type of cooperation should become the rule in our military, not the exception.

The second means for restoring our traditional facility in unconventional warfare is education. Much as in the 1960s, when the pressures of war in Indochina brought the military and other government agencies to undertake scores of counterinsurgency educational initiatives, our contemporary Army needs to do the same. Instruction in unconventional warfare—the nature of nonstate armed groups, the social and cultural structures of local tribes, the realities of conflict in failed states or ungoverned space, methods of integrating local forces into military and civil affairs operations, asymmetric warfare, the list goes on—must take place at every level of NCO and officer professional development, from NCO academies to precommissioning programs to senior service colleges. The models provided by the Cold War Military Assistance Institute, Advisor Training at Fort Bragg, and counterinsurgency training in the branch schools during the war in Vietnam can be useful in creating an educational framework that makes all of our leaders comfortable with and competent to conduct irregular operations, regardless of venue.

By providing such education and training, the Army can go a long way toward restoring its institutional comfort and facility in dealing with foreign militaries and local armed groups. In the current operating environment, there is an increasing probability that young company and field grade officers will find themselves in remote locations conducting combat or stability operations with little close supervision and no counterparts from civilian government agencies. Given this probability, it is now more necessary than ever that we educate all of our officers in the functional skills and wisdom encapsulated in the curricula of the Military Assistance Institute and its partner organizations in the 1960s. By having the largest possible number of officers educated in these areas, the Army can also ensure that military operations at the lowest levels are far better synchronized with the nation's operational and strategic goals.

The third means of restoring our institutional strength in unconventional warfare is organizational. Each Brigade Combat Team (BCT) should have as part of its structure a staff section specifically designated to deal with unconventional operations. This section, the S3-X, would be responsible for formulating unconventional warfare plans, policies, and doctrine. Additionally, each S3-X should have funds available specifically earmarked to underwrite the myriad tasks that are necessarily a part of any complete unconventional campaign portfolio: logistics, intelligence, interpreter support, as well as compensation for scouts, guides, and irregular soldiers. If each BCT commander had at his disposal a trained staff to manage contacts with local armed groups, to direct and advise subordinate units on irregular warfare, to manage pay, and to facilitate training, he would have an incredibly powerful tool at his disposal. This staff would ensure not only that his units took advantage of the possibilities presented by irregular operations, but that these operations were conducted within the framework of larger plans and within the laws and regulations that apply to such operations.

Officers assigned to a BCT S3-X staff would not need to be SF officers, nor would they need to be exclusively combat arms officers. They would, however, need to have a

level of training and experience in unconventional operations perhaps above that of the average officer. To provide such training, the Army should rely on the experts at the JFKSWCS, who could develop a course on the model of the longer advisor courses run at Fort Bragg during the Vietnam War. Officers trained at this course, along with the practical experience in counterinsurgency most officers now have, would assuredly be able to perform the desired function of the staff.

The final means to encourage and preserve widespread cultural acceptance of unconventional operations is an enlightened and cooperative personnel system. Officers should not be “tracked” into an “irregular” career path, or be given a functional area like those for Psychological Operations or Foreign Area Officers. Rather, the largest possible number of officers should be exposed to irregular operations, either as part of their formal military education, or through assignment and experience. Given the ongoing and long-term nature of our commitments in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, it would certainly be possible to rotate an enormous number of officers through assignments as trainers, advisors, or staff members on Provincial Reconstruction Teams in those countries. Other opportunities for irregular assignments exist outside of Iraq and Afghanistan. Soldiers can be embedded for 6 to 12 months with regular or paramilitary units from countries within regions of U.S. concern. For example, a potential model for this type of deployment is the yearly rotation of infantry companies from the Guam Army National Guard to Ethiopia, starting in 2004.¹⁰¹

Much the same as the policies in the early 1990s that dictated active duty assignments for providing training and advisory support to Reserve Component units (AC/RC), or assignments to Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) battalions, policies should be put in place ensuring that a maximum number of officers are rotated through critical training and advisory positions overseas. Clearly, the recent attempts to fill these positions solely through soliciting volunteers have not worked. Personnel policies that reward volunteers for serving in these positions are necessary, and a system of mandatory assignments must be put in place. Along with this kind of assignment policy, the Army needs to make language training more widely available, with some level of language training mandatory at all professional military educational levels. Current policies that effectively limit language training to Foreign Area Officers, SF soldiers, and military intelligence personnel can serve only to restrict our capability to operate effectively in areas where close cooperation with local forces, both regular and irregular, is required.

When Lieutenant Batson raised the Macabebe Scouts in 1899, he could not have known that his efforts would be some of the last of their kind in the conventional Army. He most likely would have been surprised at the suggestion that his initiatives were in any way special or out of the ordinary. His Division Commander, Brigade Commander, and many officers in between had raised scouts and worked with indigenous forces throughout their careers in low-level operations. It could seem only natural for Batson to do the same. In fact, it would have been almost unnatural for Batson and his contemporaries not to raise local units and employ tribal groups in order to assure success in their mission in the Philippines. They employed locals on a large scale, and they did succeed. In order for our Army of today to succeed, we must regain the organizational culture that allowed Batson and his contemporaries to conduct unconventional operations so unexceptionally. We have already begun to take small steps towards this end, but a truly serious and

dedicated effort to complete the process must be launched. Only then can we expect the same positive effects that the Scouts had in our earlier wars against insurrection.

ENDNOTES

1. The title of this paper is from a line in Rudyard Kipling's 1897 poem, "Pharaoh and the Sergeant," concerning the British NCOs attached to the Egyptian Army who created the force that conducted the reconquest of the Sudan, culminated at the Battle of Omdurman in 1898. The applicable stanza from the poem reads as follows:

Said England unto Pharaoh, "You've had miracles before,
When Aaron struck your rivers into blood;
But if you watch the Sergeant, he can show you something more.
He's a charm from making riflemen from mud."

See Rudyard Kipling, *The Five Nations*, London: Methuen & Co., 1903.

2. Mao Tse Tung, *On Guerrilla Warfare*, Chapter 5, 1937, accessed February 3, 2007, available from www.bellum.nu/literature/mao001.html.

3. Letter from Lieutenant Matthew Batson to his wife, dated September 24, 1899, Matthew Batson Papers, 1898-1900, Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army Military History Institute, OCLC 46910883.

4. *Ibid.* See also *The Philippine Scouts*, Daly City, CA: Philippine Scouts Heritage Society, 1996, p. 5.

5. Extract copy of memorandum dated September 1, 1899, Matthew Batson Papers, 1898-1900.

6. *The Philippine Scouts*, pp. 17-22.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 17.

8. See *Infantry Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1., July 1910, for the article introducing the Lyster Bag—a canvas bag used to dispense purified water. The indices of this journal and the *Journal of the Military Services Institution of the United States* show relatively few articles concerned with either the Philippine Scouts or the Constabulary—the vast majority of articles cover technological innovations, discussions of conventional operations, and lessons from European Armies.

9. See Thomas P. M. Barnett, *The Pentagon's New Map*, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 2004.

10. Richard H. Shultz, Jr., and Andrea J. Dew, *Insurgents, Terrorists, and Militias*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2006, p. 11.

11. Allen R. Millett and Peter Maslowski, *For the Common Defense*, New York: The Free Press, 1994, p. 15.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-46.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-13.

14. Gregory Urwin, *The United States Infantry: An Illustrated History 1775-1918*, New York: Sterling Publishing Co. Ltd., 1991, pp. 164-170.

15. See Diana M. Henderson, *Highland Soldier: A Social Study of the Highland Regiments 1820-1920*, Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1989, p. 12, for a particularly colorful example of the rhetoric employed to describe 18th century Highland soldiers. The number of examples of language describing Indians as "noble savages," or conversely as brutes is legion. See James L. Axtell, *The European and the Indian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982, for some essays concerning the complex relationships between white and native peoples in colonial North America.

16. See E. M. Lloyd, "The Raising of the Highland Regiments in 1757," *English Historical Review*, Vol. XVII, 1902, pp. 466-469; and John Prebble, *Mutiny: Highland Regiments in Revolt 1743-1804*, London: Penguin Books, 1975, p. 33.

17. Millett and Maslowski, pp. 11-13.

18. See Charles K. Dalglish, "A New 'Lodge Act' for the U.S. Army – A Strategic Tool for the Global War on Terrorism," unpublished paper, Washington, DC: National Defense University, National War College, 2005; Carlton Meyer, *Afghan Scouts*, accessed December 19, 2006, available from www.g2mil.com/Afghan%20Scouts.htm; see also Max Boot and Michael O'Hanlon, "A Military Path to Citizenship," *Washington Post*, October 19, 2006, accessed November 1, 2006, available from www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/18/AR2006101801500.html; see also Max Boot, "The Struggle to Transform the Military," *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2005.

19. Millett and Maslowski, pp. 45-46, 88-95.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 116.

21. Urwin, pp. 56-61.

22. Millett and Maslowski, pp. 251-253.

23. *Ibid.*, pp. 254-255.

24. Thomas W. Dunlay, *Wolves for the Blue Soldiers: Indian Scouts and Auxiliaries with the United States Army, 1860-90*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982, pp 44-46; Act of July 28, 1866, 39th Congress Session I, Chapter 299, p. 333, accessed March 9, 2007, available from memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llsl&fileName=014/llsl014.db&recNum=364.

25. This insignia of crossed arrows was ultimately adopted by the Special Forces when they became a distinct branch of the Army in accordance with G.O. Number 35 in April 1987. See "Images of Indian Scouts," accessed March 8, 2007, available from www.army.mil/cmh-pg/topic/natam/idnscts.htm.

26. Dunlay, pp. 44-46.

27. Evan S. Connell, *Son of the Morning Star: Custer and the Little Bighorn*, New York: Harper & Row, 1984, pp. 12, 14-18.

28. "Seminole-Negro Indian Scouts," accessed March 7, 2007, available from www.buffalosoldier.net/SeminoleNegroIndianScouts.htm; and "Seminole Indian Scouts," accessed March 7, 2007, available from www.texancultures.utsa.edu/seminole/seminolescouts.htm.

29. *Ibid.*

30. See Dunlay, pp. 28-30 and Chapter 10, for references to Apache Scouts. See also "Apache Scouts," accessed March 7, 2007, available from www.grenzer.com/11scout.htm. See also "Images of Indian Scouts," accessed March 8, 2007, available from www.army.mil/cmh-pg/topic/natam/idnscts.htm.

31. Major General Lawton served as a captain in the 4th Cavalry during Miles' successful campaign to capture Geronimo, and developed a recognized expertise in negotiation and military cooperation with local tribes. Lawton, through his connection to the 4th Cavalry, identified Lieutenant Batson as an intelligent, highly competent officer, and had him seconded to his staff during the war in Cuba. It is highly probable that Lawton was behind some of the initial concepts to raise local tribal scouts in his division's area in the Philippines. See memoir of service, Matthew Batson Papers, 1898-1900. See also Franklin Matthews, "Henry W. Lawton, the Soldier and the Man," *Harper's Weekly*, January 6, 1900, accessed April 1, 2007, available from www.culbertsonmansion.com/Lawton/Info/Harpers1900-01-06.htm.

32. See John R. White, *Bullets and Bolos*, New York: The Century Company, 1928, a memoir of service in the Philippine Constabulary.

33. Andrew James Birtle, *U.S. Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine, 1860-1941*, Washington, DC: U.S. Army Center for Military History, 1998, p. 116.

34. Brian McAllister Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2000, p. 128.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

36. *Ibid.*, pp. 76-79.

37. *Ibid.*, pp. 128, 143-144.

38. Memorandum dated October 16, 1899, from Brigadier S. B. M. Young, HQ Provisional Cavalry Brigade, 1st Division, Matthew Batson Papers, 1898-1900.

39. *Ibid.*, order dated May 24, 1900.

40. Linn, p. 260.

41. See Millett and Maslowski, pp. 12-13, 42-44, and 252-257.

42. Linn, p. 260.

43. Letter packet, Matthew Batson Papers, 1898-1900.

44. Linn, p. 260.

45. *Ibid.*, pp. 203-204.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 204; Birtle, p. 116.

47. *Ibid.*

48. See White for a comprehensive account of the organization, training, and operational employment of the Constabulary. See also Birtle, pp. 154-158.

49. *The Philippine Scouts*, p. 6; Linn, p. 260.

50. Linn, p. 260. Brigadier General Frederick Funston was highly experienced and comfortable with irregulars — prior to the U.S. war with Spain he had served as a volunteer with Cuban guerrillas against the Spanish. He gained further notice when he engineered the capture of Emilio Aguinaldo using Macabebe Scouts; pretending to be guerrillas bringing in captured Americans, the Scouts brought Funston and several

other officers into Aguinaldo's camp, and then the *ad hoc* unit killed some of Aguinaldo's body guard and captured him (Linn, pp. 274-275).

51. Letter from Office of Chief Commissary, Philippine Islands, dated February 21, 1901, Matthew Batson Papers, 1898-1900.

52. *The Philippine Scouts*, p. 5.

53. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-13.

54. For contemporary views on politics, government, and security policies in the Philippines, see Francis Burton Harrison, *The Cornerstone of Philippine Independence; a Narrative of Seven Years*, New York: The Century Company, 1922. Harrison served as Governor-General of the Philippines from 1913 to 1921. See also Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines Past and Present*, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1930. Worcester served as Secretary of the Interior of the Philippines and as a member of the Philippine Commission from 1900 to 1913.

55. For descriptions of the events surrounding and the process of raising these and other colonial units, see Thomas Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa: White Man's Conquest of the Dark Continent from 1876-1912*, New York: Avon Books, 1991; Charles Allen, *Soldier Sahibs: the Daring Adventurers who Tamed India's Northwest Frontier*, New York: Carroll and Graf, 2000.

56. One of the more interesting armed groups working with the Army during the counterinsurgency campaign in Northern Luzon in 1901 was the religious sect "Guardia de Honor," led by Crispulo Patajo. On the other side was the armed Kapunan Society group led by Father Gregorio Agilpay – 300 men from this group were killed in mass assaults against American positions on the nights of April 13-14, 1901. Linn, pp. 260-261.

57. *Ibid.*, p. 260; and White, especially Chapter XIX.

58. Birtle, p. 155.

59. Pershing served three tours in the Philippines between 1899 and 1913. He was ultimately assigned as the Military Governor of Sulu Province, and worked closely with the Scouts and Constabulary to suppress endemic lawlessness and insurrection among the Moro people. Leonard Wood likewise served as Governor in Sulu before becoming Chief of Staff of the Army. See White, Chapter XXVII; Urwin, p. 160; and Birtle, pp. 159-168.

60. Birtle, p. 154.

61. White, pp. vii-xii.

62. Richard Millett, *Guardians of the Dynasty*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1977, pp. 42-44.

63. Birtle, pp. 271-272.

64. *Ibid.*, pp. 275-282.

65. In his memoir, Ramsey relates a particularly memorable instance of cultural differences leading to moral conflict in irregular operations. During a meeting with one of his counterpart American guerrilla leaders in northern Luzon, Ramsey began discussing the nature of their job. The other American, Captain Charles Putnam, argued that what they were doing was different from any other kind of military leadership and illustrated his point by describing some of his tribal soldiers:

You see those hills there? That's the territory of the Igorots and Ilongots. You know about them? . . . Well what you've heard is true. They're headhunters, and some of 'em are cannibals. They love Japanese raids, Ramsey; they invite them. You know why? 'Cause that's the only time they have full bellies. That's not military, and it sure as hell's no job. That's guerrilla warfare, and as far as they're concerned, I'm no captain, I'm the king.

See Edwin Price Ramsey and Stephen J. Rivele, *Lieutenant Ramsey's War*, New York: Brassey's, 1990, pp. 162-163.

66. *Ibid.*

67. General Harold K. Johnson, Army Chief of Staff during the Vietnam War, began his career as an officer in the 57th Infantry, Philippine Scouts. He participated in the Bataan Death March with the rest of the regiment, and spent the remainder of World War II in Japanese captivity. See "General Harold K. Johnson," accessed March 9, 2007, available from www.governor.state.nd.us/awards/rr-gallery/johnson.html.

68. See U.S. Office of Strategic Services, *Special Unit, Detachment 101, Office of Strategic Services Detachment 101, Nazira, India, 1942-1945*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army Military History Institute, Stacks number D767.6.U56.

69. The Jay D. Vanderpool Papers, 1953-1983, Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army Military History Institute, OCLC 47911297, oral history transcript Box 1.

70. *Ibid.*

71. *Ibid.*

72. *Ibid.*

73. Walter F. Choinski, "The Military Assistance Institute: An Historical Summary of Its Organization, Program, and Accomplishments 1958-1968," Special Report October 1969, American Institutes for Research, in The Henry C. Newton Papers, Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army Military History Institute, pp. 1-2, OCLC 46832145.

74. "U.S. Military Advisory Group to the Republic of Korea (KMAG) Advisors Handbook," March 1, 1951, Daniel G. Doyle Papers 1921-1962, Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army Military History Institute, OCLC 47003107.

75. Choinski, p. 3.

76. Henry C. Newton Papers.

77. Choinski, p. 5.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

79. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

80. Report on visit to U.S. Army Institute of Military Assistance, dated August 24, 1971, Tab G, p. 1, Henry C. Newton Papers.

81. *Ibid.*

82. *Ibid.*, Cover Memorandum and Tab G, p. 1-2.

83. *Ibid.*, Cover Memorandum.

84. *Ibid.*; Birtle, p. 257-258.

85. Report on visit to U.S. Army Institute of Military Assistance, Tab G, p. 2.

86. See Lewis Sorley, *A Better War: The Unexamined Victories and Final Tragedy of America's Last Years in Vietnam*, Orlando, FL: Harcourt, 1999, for a detailed account of General Creighton Abrams' counterinsurgency strategies from 1968 to 1972.

87. Birtle, pp. 257-258.

88. *Ibid.*, pp. 260-261.

89. *Ibid.*

90. *Ibid.*, p. 261.

91. *Ibid.*, p. 263.

92. *Ibid.*, pp. 265-266.

93. *Ibid.*, pp. 264-265.

94. Author interviews with Vice Chief of Staff, and G3-X, U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC), February 14, 2007.

95. None of the U.S. surrogate forces in Vietnam, the Nungs and Montagnards for example, were formally demobilized at the close of U.S. involvement there. By the summer of 2006, roughly 3,000 ASF soldiers had been formally demobilized in Afghanistan.

96. From December 2005 to May 2006, the author was the CJSOTF-A project officer responsible for planning and carrying out the bulk of this demobilization.

97. The Afghan National Army and Police are centrally trained and controlled, and their units are deliberately kept ethnically and regionally mixed.

98. In the Army's new counterinsurgency manual, Field Manual 3-24, the words "Irregular Warfare" are mentioned only twice, in the Introduction. "Unconventional Warfare" is not mentioned at all – a glaring omission, pointing out this reluctance and the lack of doctrinal emphasis on this deeply important aspect of current operations. The fact that the only joint, DoD-level publication that explicitly deals with irregular operations was published only in draft form in December 2006 is another indication that the military as an institution is still far from any kind of comfort with this type of mission (Department of Defense, *Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept [JOC]*, Pre-Decision Draft Version 0.5, December 2006).

99. See Sean Naylor, *Not a Good Day to Die: The Untold Story of Operation Anaconda*, New York: Penguin Group, 2005. Naylor discusses some of the problems of effectiveness and loyalty evident in the performance of Afghan auxiliaries during the early period of fighting in Afghanistan. See also Charles Briscoe, Richard L. Kiper, James A. Schroder, and Kalev I. Sepp, *Weapon of Choice: ARSOF in Afghanistan*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army Center for Military History, 2005, for an exhaustive account of Army Special Operations Forces in Afghanistan from 2001 to 2002.

100. Major Philip M. Zeman, USMC, "Operation Iraqi Freedom Mission Breadth," unpublished paper. Also, interview with Major Zeman, March 2, 2007. Major Zeman was the Executive officer, 3-4 Marines during the period 2004-05.

101. Senior Airman Christine R. Martinez, "Guam Guard Takes Long Mission in Africa," accessed March 4, 2007, available from www.usarpac.army.mil/news/guamguardhoa.asp.